

EXHIBIT 8

MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)
MJacobs@mofo.com
ARTURO J. GONZÁLEZ (CA SBN 121490)
AGonzalez@mofo.com
ERIC A. TATE (CA SBN 178719)
ETate@mofo.com
RUDY Y. KIM (CA SBN 199426)
RKim@mofo.com
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105-2482
Telephone: 415.268.7000
Facsimile: 415.268.7522

KAREN L. DUNN (*Pro Hac Vice*)
kdunn@bsfllp.com
HAMISH P.M. HUME (*Pro Hac Vice*)
hhume@bsfllp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
1401 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington DC 20005
Telephone: 202.237.2727
Facsimile: 202.237.6131

Attorneys for Defendants
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
and OTTOMOTTO LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

WAYMO LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**DEFENDANTS UBER
TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND
OTTOMOTTO LLC'S OBJECTIONS
AND RESPONSES TO WAYMO'S
THIRD SET OF REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS
(NOS. 153-265)**

Trial Date: October 2, 2017

1 subject matter, and time, and is irrelevant and not proportional to the needs of the case to the
2 extent it calls for the production of documents that are unrelated to this litigation. Defendants
3 further object to this request as irrelevant, overbroad, and not proportional to the needs of the case
4 to the extent that it seeks “all” documents and communications.

5
6 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 163:**

7 All DOCUMENTS and COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING the naming of OWL.

8 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 163:**

9 Defendants will produce non-privileged documents sufficient to show the naming of
10 OWL, if any, located through a reasonably diligent search.

11 Defendants object to this Request as irrelevant, overbroad, and not proportional to the
12 needs of the case; specifically, Defendants object that the Request is overbroad as to scope,
13 subject matter, and time, and is irrelevant and not proportional to the needs of the case to the
14 extent it calls for the production of documents that are unrelated to this litigation. Defendants
15 further object to this request as irrelevant, overbroad, and not proportional to the needs of the case
16 to the extent that it seeks “all” documents and communications.

17
18 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 164:**

19 All COMMUNICATIONS between Brian McClendon and any PERSON REGARDING
20 LiDAR, OTTOMOTTO, OTTO TRUCKING, or LEVANDOWSKI.

21 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 164:**

22 Defendants have already produced COMMUNICATIONS responsive to this Request,
23 including, without limitation, in Production Volume 52. Defendants will produce additional
24 responsive, non-privileged COMMUNICATIONS between Brian McClendon and any person
25 regarding Ottomotto, Otto Trucking, or Anthony Levandowski before August 23, 2016, and
26 regarding Mr. Levandowski after August 23, 2016, if such COMMUNICATIONS exist and can
27 be located through a reasonably diligent search.

1 Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks information protected by the
2 attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine or that is otherwise privileged or protected
3 from discovery. Defendants further object to this Request as irrelevant, overbroad, and not
4 proportional to the needs of the case; specifically, Defendants object that the Request is overbroad
5 as to scope, subject matter, and time, and is irrelevant and not proportional to the needs of the
6 case to the extent it calls for the production of documents that are unrelated to this litigation.
7 Defendants further object to this request as irrelevant, overbroad, and not proportional to the
8 needs of the case to the extent that it seeks “all” documents and communications. Defendants
9 additionally object that responding to this Request would be oppressive and unduly burdensome.

10
11 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 165:**

12 All COMMUNICATIONS between Travis Kalanick and any PERSON REGARDING
13 LiDAR, OTTOMOTTO, OTTO TRUCKING, or LEVANDOWSKI.

14 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 165:**

15 Defendants have already produced COMMUNICATIONS responsive to this Request,
16 including, without limitation, in Production Volume 52, which included all communications
17 between Travis Kalanick and Anthony Levandowski; communications between Mr. Kalanick and
18 anyone regarding LiDAR; and communications between Mr. Kalanick and anyone regarding
19 Mr. Levandowski, Ottomotto, or Otto Trucking before August 23, 2016. Defendants will produce
20 additional responsive, non-privileged COMMUNICATIONS between Mr. Kalanick and anyone
21 regarding Mr. Levandowski after August 23, 2016, if such COMMUNICATIONS exist and can
22 be located through a reasonably diligent search.

23 Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks information protected by the
24 attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine or that is otherwise privileged or protected
25 from discovery. Defendants further object to this Request as irrelevant, overbroad, and not
26 proportional to the needs of the case; specifically, Defendants object that the Request is overbroad
27 as to scope, subject matter, and time, and is irrelevant and not proportional to the needs of the
28 case to the extent it calls for the production of documents that are unrelated to this litigation.

1 Defendants further object to this request as irrelevant, overbroad, and not proportional to the
2 needs of the case to the extent that it seeks “all” documents and communications. Defendants
3 additionally object that responding to this Request would be oppressive and unduly burdensome.

4
5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 166:**

6 All COMMUNICATIONS between John Bares and any PERSON REGARDING
7 OTTOMOTTO, OTTO TRUCKING, or LEVANDOWSI.

8 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 166:**

9 Defendants have already produced COMMUNICATIONS responsive to this Request,
10 including, without limitation, in Production Volumes 22 and 51. Defendants will produce
11 additional responsive, non-privileged COMMUNICATIONS between John Bares and any person
12 regarding Ottomotto, Otto Trucking, or Anthony Levandowski before August 23, 2016, and
13 regarding Mr. Levandowski after August 23, 2016, if such COMMUNICATIONS exist and can
14 be located through a reasonably diligent search.

15 Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks information protected by the
16 attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine or that is otherwise privileged or protected
17 from discovery. Defendants further object to this Request as irrelevant, overbroad, and not
18 proportional to the needs of the case; specifically, Defendants object that the Request is overbroad
19 as to scope, subject matter, and time, and is irrelevant and not proportional to the needs of the
20 case to the extent it calls for the production of documents that are unrelated to this litigation.
21 Defendants further object to this request as irrelevant, overbroad, and not proportional to the
22 needs of the case to the extent that it seeks “all” documents and communications. Defendants
23 additionally object that responding to this Request would be oppressive and unduly burdensome.

24
25 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 167:**

26 All COMMUNICATIONS between Cameron Poetzsch and any PERSON
27 REGARDING LiDAR, OTTOMOTTO, OTTO TRUCKING, or LEVANDOWSI.

1 Defendants will produce additional non-privileged documents, if such documents exist
2 and can be located through a reasonably diligent search, sufficient to show LiDAR designs with
3 slowly horizontally oscillating systems in LiDAR designs developed by Defendants.

4 To the extent this Request seeks anything other than the previously described information,
5 Defendants object to this Request as unreasonably overbroad, irrelevant, outside the scope of this
6 litigation, harassing, and not proportional to the needs of the case, including to the extent that it
7 requests information about LiDAR designs developed by third-parties and/or implicates non-
8 disclosure agreements with third parties. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent
9 that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine or
10 that is otherwise privileged or protected from discovery. Defendants further object to this
11 Request on the ground that the phrase “consideration or implementation” is vague and ambiguous.
12

13 Dated: June 30, 2017

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

14 By: /s/ Arturo J. González
15 ARTURO J. GONZÁLEZ

16 Attorneys for Defendants
17 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
18 and OTTOMOTTO LLC

19 va-497849
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28